LIFE IS GOOD, INC. V. LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC Civil Action No. 04 11290 WGY

DECLARATION OF TIMOTHY LEMPER IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION IN LIMINE TO STRIKE THE SURVEY OF PLAINTIFF'S EXPERT ROBERT KLEIN

Exhibit 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS 2 3 LIFE IS GOOD., INC., 4 Plaintiff, Civil Action 5 No. 04-cv-11290-REK 6 vs. LG ELECTRONICS, U.S.A., INC., 7 LG ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM 8 U.S.A., INC., (formerly 9 ORIGINAL 10 LG INFOCOMM U.S.A., INC.), 11 Defendants. 12 13 DEPOSITION OF ROBERT KLEIN, a witness called by and on behalf of the Defendants, taken pursuant to 14 the provisions of the Federal Rules of Civil 15 Procedure, before Dana Welch, a Registered 16 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and 17 for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at the 18 19 offices of Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP, 55 Cambridge Parkway, Suite 700, 20

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Cambridge, Massachusetts, on Friday, January 24,

2006, commencing at 10:31 a.m.

202-347-3700

Nationwide Coverage 800-336-6646

21

1	Q. And so you could be measuring the wrong
2	thing?
3	A. I think that would be the argument.
4	Q. How about Adidas, did you do a survey for
5	that case?
6	A. No.
7	Q. Was that a trademark case?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Did you deal with Michael Heilbronner at
10	Adidas in any way?
11	A. Not that I know of.
12	Q. And what did you do for Adidas?
13	A. I provided a rebuttal report on behalf of
14	ES Originals to a survey that had been conducted by
15	on behalf of Adidas.
16	Q. Did you work with Lisa Perrone?
17	A. The name is familiar, but I don't think she
18	was I don't recall her from that matter.
19	Q. Whose survey did you rebut?
20	A. I believe it was Gerald Ford's.
21	MR. KIRBY: Not the President.
22	THE DEPONENT: No.

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Nationwide Coverage 800-336-6646

410-684-2550

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

BY MR. RETTEW:

- O. From Ford, Bubala & Associates?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And briefly, what was the nature of your critique?
- A. I felt that the product shown to people was not shown in a -- as they would see it and encounter it in the real world. And I had some issues with the control that was -- that was used in the case.
- Q. When you say the stimulus was not what people would see in the real world, what specifically did they use in that survey?
- A. They used a drawing from a shoe as seen from kind of, if you were lying on the floor looking at it sideways. And the allegations of the case had to do with initial interest, confusion where you might see it -- someone wearing the shoe and ask where did you buy that.
 - Q. So what's wrong with showing a drawing?
- A. Well, in this particular matter, they were claiming that people would see the shoe as someone else were wearing it. And so if that's the claim,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

then why not show it that way.

- Q. So they should have shown the actual shoe?
- A. Or a picture of the shoe or a picture of a model wearing a shoe.
- Q. And was this an Eveready format that Ford did?
 - A. Basically, yes.
 - Q. What control did he use?
- A. He used an all-white shoe that -- that removed both the offending stripes, as well as some other identifying characteristics. And I had some problems with the fact that he took the other identifying characteristics off as well.
 - Q. What's wrong with that?
- A. Well, if you're alleging that there is -that the infringing feature is the stripes on the
 shoe, and you don't have any problem with the heel
 patch, then to have a control that is missing both
 the stripes and the heel patch is confounding the
 issue.
- Q. Because it's not measuring true noise in that case?

1.0

A. If the if the target market corresponds
to the actual market, then it becomes relevant. Bu
from a marketing point of view, you might target,
you know, girls 14 to 25, but your product might be
bought by anyone.

And so with your advertising, you might target a particular segment, but if the product could be bought and was bought by virtually everyone, then narrowing the universe to that target market would be inappropriate.

- Q. Did you test forward or reverse confusion in this case?
- A. In this case, it really wasn't a -- an issue of reverse confusion or forward confusion, given the widespread distribution and purchasing -- widespread distribution of the purchasing population for both the products. The overlap is so huge that whether it's forward or reverse confusion wasn't a problem here.
- Q. What's your understanding of what forward confusion is?
 - A. Forward confusion would be a situation in

whic	ch the	pot	tent:	ial pu	rchas	ers (of the	junior	user
are	confu	sed	and	think	that	the	produc	ct comes	from
the	senio	r u	ser.						

- O. And reverse confusion?
- A. Where potential purchasers of the senior product are confused and think that the product comes from the junior user.
- Q. And just so I understand your testimony, are you saying that you tested one, the other or both?
 - A. Either. Because -- well, either.
- Q. So it's possible to do a confusion survey where you're testing both forward and reverse confusion with the same set of questions?
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. In this case, did you ask people whether -- you asked people -- strike that.
- Okay. Let's talk about LG. What's your understanding of what LG makes?
- A. It's my understanding that LG makes a wide variety of electronics, from cell phones to TVs to computer monitors to refrigerators, washers, dryers,

))

22

1	alternatives for how to display that.
2	Q. Is it your understanding that the only
3	objectionable part of LG's logo was the words
4	"Life's Good"?
5	MR. KIRBY: Object to the form.
6	THE DEPONENT: It's my understanding
7	that that is the focus of their of the you
8	know, confusion and concern about confusion.
9	BY MR. RETTEW:
10	Q. Did you talk about different survey designs
11	during that meeting?
12	A. I don't have a specific recollection of
13	that. We certainly you know, it certainly would
14	have been an appropriate topic.
15	Q. Okay. Did you talk about specific
16	controls; do you remember?
17	A. I don't recall whether we discussed
18	specific controls at that point or not.
19	Q. And what happened after that meeting?
20	A. After that meeting, there were we
21	conducted some exploratory interviews at a mall in

New Jersey to get a better understanding of people's

awareness of various slogan's including "Life is good." as well as recognition of different symbols and logos. And finally, sort of testing different ways of showing people products.

Q. Why did you do that?

- A. It's an important step in any survey research design is to first get a better understanding. Often, your client's version of kind of what people believe or know can be different than what you actually find in the market and it's important to test those things yourselves.
 - Q. What did this pretest show?
- A. Pretest showed that -- that awareness of
 Life is good. as a trademark was relatively low,
 that awareness of LG was relatively high as a -- as
 a company that most people associated with cell
 phones. And kind of if we, you know, showed people
 the Life is good. emblem and LG's use of "Life's
 Good" with the face and the initials LG, that there
 was -- that people saw the connection and identified
 that in connection as being related to the use of
 the phrase "Life's Good."

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

by virtually anyone"?

- A. The products that they make are not, you know, exclusively, for example, male or female. They're not just for people over 65. There's no constraint on marketing that would prevent someone from, if not actually purchasing an LG or Life is good. product, from certainly considering it and being in a position to react to the trademark.
- Q. Have you ever done any other surveys where the universe was all adults?
 - A. Well, sure. But I mean --
- Q. What was the product involved in those cases?
- A. I mean, it wasn't necessarily a trademark issue or litigation.
- Q. I'm sorry. Let me clarify. Litigation survey for a trademark case.
- A. No. I don't -- wait a minute. Let me -- hold that answer for a second. Yeah. No, that's fine. No is the answer.
- Q. And you don't know whether the people included in your survey own cell phones?

)

)

Α.

A. No.
Q. And you don't know if the people included
in your survey intended to purchase a cell phone?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you don't know if people in your survey
owned appliances?
A. That's correct. Well, okay. No.
Q. You don't know if the people in your survey
owned the type of appliances that LG makes?
A. That's okay. Well, okay. Although LG
makes refrigerators. And so to the extent that mos
households in the U.S. have a refrigerator, you know
Q. Well, you don't know if people included in
your survey had actually bought appliances?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you don't know if people included in
your survey intended to buy appliances?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you don't know if people included in
your survey owned computer monitors?

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

That's correct.

1	Q. Or any other computer products?
2	A. That's correct.
3	Q. And you don't know if people included in
4	your survey intended to buy computer monitors?
5	A. That's correct.
6	Q. And you don't know if the people included
7	in your survey intended to buy any other computer
8	products?
9	A. That's correct.
10	Q. And you don't know if the people included
11	in your survey owned any Life is good. T-shirts?
12	A. That's right.
13	Q. And you don't know if the people included
14	in your survey intended to buy Life is good.
15	T-shirts?
16	A. That's correct.
17	Q. Now, you say you tested both forward and
18	reverse confusion in this survey; is that correct?
19	A. I think what I said was that the survey
20	that I conducted was equally applicable to forward
21	as well as reverse confusion.

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Q. And you used a national sample in the

)

19

20

21

22

Α.

Yes.

1	BY MR. RETTEW:
2	Q. All right. Mr. Klein, with your universe
3	being everybody over 18 years of age, do you have
4	any sense of the census data on how many people that
5	is?
6	A. How many
7	Q. How many people total were in your
8	universe; how many people would have qualified?
9	A. I thought, actually, I included that here,
10	but I didn't. It was on the document that was
11	produced yesterday, I guess. The document that says
12	quota.xls has census data in it.
13	MR. RETTEW: Let's go off the record for
14	a second.
15	(Marked, Exhibit 88, AMS 003591.)
16	BY MR. RETTEW:
17	Q. I'm showing you what's been marked
18	Exhibit 88. Does that help you answer my previous

Q. And what is that number?

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

question on what was the total number of adults in

the U.S. that could have qualified for the survey?

1	A. 247,110,005.
2	Q. And you found that 18 you found that
3	there would be 18 percent confusion net?
4	A. That's correct.
5	Q. And so roughly how many people would that
6	be?
7	A. Approximately 44 and a half million people.
8	Q. And of that 44 and a half million people,
9	how many instances of actual confusion would you
10	expect there to be in this case?
11	A. I don't have a basis for making that
12	estimate.
13	Q. Would you just based on your experience
14	and expertise, would you expect that there would be
15	a lot of people would have expressed confusion?
16	MR. KIRBY: Object to the form. To
17	whom?
18	BY MR. RETTEW:
19	Q. To either party.
20	A. What I measured was likelihood of
21	confusion. And actual confusion is going to depend

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

on the extent to which LG continues to advertise and

- Q. And did any problems arise in this survey?
- A. Yes.

Э

C

- Q. What happened?
- A. As I say in the report, the Florida field site had a -- where's the part that I identify. In one location that was in Florida, our validation identified a significant deviation from the protocol. When we called people to ask them the validation questions, we would ask them, "Did you receive \$5 for your participation?" And the people in Florida said, no, they didn't. They were told they had to come back later to get their \$5.

 That -- I mean, if they couldn't do that part right, we simply discarded all those questionnaires without reviewing them, although you have copies of them.

And in a second location, the particular interviewer apparently falsified nine out of ten of the first interviews she did, and we discarded all of her work.

Q. How do you know -- well, what location was that?

1	A. San Fra
2	Q. And how
3 ,	interviews?
4	A. Well, o
5	interviews sinc
6	we contacted th
7	did not acknowle
8	MR.

)

)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

ncisco.

do you know she falsified her

kay, we assumed she falsified the e nine out of ten of the people that at she claimed to have interviewed edge being interviewed.

Sort of a give-away.

THE DEPONENT: There were --

BY MR. RETTEW:

- Q. Any other problems?
- And then there were four additional interviews that that did not validate, but they were scattered in locations and we decided to exclude them as well.

One of the things that happens in mall intercept studies is that when you ask people for their name and phone number in order to do the validation, some people don't want to be recontacted and are -- and so they give you a -- or they give you their work number, but you only get their first And you call up asking for Jim at a company name.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

of 1,000 people, so you don't get the appropriate
validation. So as I said, there were four
additional interviews like that, two from Chicago,
one from Dallas, one from Des Moines. And we
excluded those as well.

- Q. Have you ever had this many problems in a survey?
 - A. No.
- Q. Have you ever heard of there being this many problems in a survey?
 - A. No.
- Q. Do you usually discard the questionnaires that are not validated?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. That's your standard practice?
- 16 A. Yes.
 - Q. Did you discard any of the other surveys that -- strike that. Let me ask a better question.

Of the surveys that didn't -- the questionnaires that didn't validate, did you examine the other questionnaires that were done by those particular interviewers to see if there were

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

problems that were systematic to the interviewer?

A. As I said, in San Francisco, nine out of the ten interviews done by this particular interviewer didn't validate. So we threw all of hers away.

We did 100 percent validation. So the only other site was the Florida site where, in reality, we might have kept those, those interviews. The field site said that the check hadn't -- they didn't have the cash in their account to pay these people. We sent them the check. Everybody else got their checks. We don't know what happened there. But it was just such a screwy thing to happen that we felt better about throwing away the interviews than, you know, accepting what was at least, I'd say, a significant deviation from the protocol we specified.

- Q. When these documents were produced to us, there were some sticky notes that had some explanation of what appears to be an explanation of why these were discarded.
 - A. Uh-huh.

1.0

77 7	7 38	T	\mathbf{r}	$rac{1}{2}$	7 777	TTT.	7
B_{λ}	/ (V)	R.	\sim	H		EW	
13	L 1'1	1/-	1			T-1 V 1	1 -

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

- Q. Mr. Klein, I've shown you what's been marked as Exhibit 90. Can you tell me, after going through it, what these are?
- A. Well, I'm not sure whether we -- I mean, I guess, first of all, these are all Florida interviews. They were all discarded. I can find out for you what "exhibit rotation error" means.
- Q. Yeah. We would request that you do that because that was going to be my next question: What does that mean, exhibit rotation error?
 - A. Well --
- Q. Is this the first time you've heard of there being an exhibit rotation error?
 - A. Yes. At least to the best of my memory.

MR. KIRBY: What I can't tell you is whether that sticky went to all of the interviews attached to Exhibit 90 or just the front one. And it could be a mistake on my behalf or by our copy service. I just don't know.

BY MR. RETTEW:

Q. Do you, Mr. Klein, have any thoughts on

)

)

that, can you enlighten us as to whether that is the
case or is not the case? If you don't know then
A. I don't know. I mean, I think I can
MR. KIRBY: We can try to find out for
you.
THE DEPONENT: I can try to track it
down.
MR. KIRBY: If they threw them all out
for that other problem with the payment issue, it
was academic and they didn't pursue it. But we can
find out, too.
BY MR. RETTEW:
Q. I appreciate that. And rather than waste
your time, I'll just move on to the next one and
just ask that you follow up on that.
(Marked, Exhibit 91, AMS 000430-000477.)
BY MR. RETTEW:
Q. The next one I'm showing you is Exhibit 91.
It's got a Post-it that says, "Bad skip pattern
errors caught by field site."
A. Right.

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Q. My question is, what is this?

A. Well, I'll use the first one as an example.
I'll assume that the or I can go through each one
to make sure that it's the same way. But what this
would yeah, it looks like they're all done the
same way. If you look at question 3, page AMS 434.
Q. Yes.
A So this person said "different companies"

and was supposed to have skipped then to question 4.

Okay? And instead, the interviewer continued with question 3A. Now, these interviews and screeners were all prenumbered with the rotation and exhibit rotation marked on them. And so this was caught by the field site and replaced -- you know, they did an extra interview to replace it. But they returned the documents to us so we would have the complete set. But these would not be part of the data set that was analyzed.

- Q. So documents 430 to 477 were all excluded?
- A. Yes.

- Q. And were all of Barbara Jackson's interviews excluded?
 - A. Well, these weren't Barbara Jackson's

re	₽p	0	rt	?
----	----	---	----	---

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- A. Right.
- Q. And these interviewer errors spanned among different interviewers and different markets?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Does this at least suggest to you that perhaps the questions were confusing for interviewers?
 - A. No.
- Q. But you've never seen this many mistakes before.
 - A. Correct.
 - O. What does that tell you, if anything?
- A. We did a really bad job of laying out the questionnaire. I mean, it should have been much clearer to the interviewers that -- where they went at each -- at each stage. And there should have been arrows on these pages; and when they got here it should have said, end. You know, if you've done something here, you're done, you know, go on. It was -- it was laid out in a way that was confusing to interviewers, and they -- when they weren't able

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

Α.

to follow the instructions, we didn't feel we could include those results that didn't follow the instructions, regardless of what those results were. MR. RETTEW: Mark this one. (Marked, Exhibit 94, AMS 000586-000810.) BY MR. RETTEW: Okay. Mr. Klein, looking at Exhibit 94, this says "tossed because of site error." And my question is, were all of the interviews shown in -excuse me -- all the questionnaires shown in Exhibit 94 excluded? Yes. Α. And was this for the reasons you said earlier, for the site error in Fort Lauderdale? That's correct. At least, I mean, that's Α. why I would have tossed them all. They are all from Fort Lauderdale and none of them are in the database. Are part of the problems with this interview due to the company that you used to administer the survey?

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Nationwide Coverage

202-347-3700

I don't think so.

800-336-6646

410-684-2550

I think it was the --